

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Hufnagle

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: NVN 044574/2800

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): **516 DM 11.9 E. Realty** (12) Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2011-C020-0500-CX

Project Name: Buried Power Line ROW Amendment - CC Shooting Range

Project Description:

Sierra Pacific Power Company (NV Energy) proposes to bury portions of an existing overhead line that provides power to Carson City public works facilities. The project is needed to protect the power lines from being vandalized by shooting activities. The line is located on public lands leased to Carson City for a shooting range (R&PP Lease NVN 018772). The proposed ROW amendment dimensions are approximately 1,000 feet by 40 feet. NV Energy proposes to remove 2 wood poles and associated wire and replace portions of the overhead line with buried line. The proposed buried line follows the same alignment as the existing line or would be within existing road disturbance. No new roads or road improvement is proposed. Construction is anticipated to occur over a 30-day period beginning in April of 2011 (or upon BLM approval of the ROW amendment).

Applicant Name: Sierra Pacific Power Company

Project Location: T. 15 N., R 20 E., section 12, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 0.9

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): LND-7, Administrative Actions #6, Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where the analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public.& ROW-4, Administrative Actions 3, ...applicants for right-of-way grants...are subject to standard approval procedures outlined in the right-of-way regulations (43 CFR 2800)...

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

(Specialist
review:
initial in
appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety?		JHT
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		SC DT - BLM sensitive plant species. ADC PZ - Mig birds
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]?		JHT
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		JHT
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		JHT
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		JHT
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office?		SC
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		DT - plants PZ - animals
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		JHT
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)?		JHT
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)?		SC
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)?		DT - Attach weed stipulations

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW: During ID Team consideration of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists concurred with this CX:

Jo Ann Hufnagle, Lead Realty Specialist
Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner
Nicole Cutler, Hydrologist
Steve Christy, Archaeologist
Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist
Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist
Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

DECISION: It is my decision to implement the actions as described and approve amendment of the existing ROW grant. No additional stipulations are required.

Approved by:



Linda J. Kelly
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office



(date)